

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 51-56, 58, 60-81, 83, 85-106, 108, and 110-125 are pending in this case.

The Examiner rejected claims 51, 52, 54-56, 58, 65, 66, 68, 71-77, 79-81, 83, 90, 91, 93, 96-102, 104-106, 108, 115, 116, 118, and 121-125 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Matthews, III et al U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 (hereinafter "Matthews"). The Examiner rejected claims 60-64, 67, 69, 70, 85-89, 92, 94, 95, 110-114, 117, 119, and 120 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Shoff et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 (hereinafter "Shoff"). The Examiner rejected claims 53, 78, and 103 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Davis U.S. Patent No. 5,559,548 (hereinafter "Davis").

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Summary of Telephonic Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview of October 5, 2005.

With respect to independent claims 51, 76, and 101, applicants asserted during the interview that applicants' invention advantageously determines a potential upcoming need for a given portion of supplemental information based on a

user's actions in navigating through the guide and supplies the given portion of supplemental data from the remote memory in advance of the upcoming need. Applicants further asserted that applicants' invention is advantageous because it dynamically determines a potential upcoming need for supplemental information as the user navigates through the guide and is therefore immediately responsive to indications of user interest, whereas Matthews merely uses static information on a user's past viewing tendencies to predict which information should be pre-cached ahead of a broadcast. The Examiner maintained that the claims, as written, were not patentable over the prior art and suggested that applicants amend the claims to clarify the intended invention. Applicants maintain our arguments regarding the prior version of the claims. However, in order to advance prosecution of this application, applicants have amended the claims to further clarify the claimed invention.

Amendments to The Claims

Applicants have amended independent claims 51, 76, and 101 to further clarify the claimed invention. Applicants have amended dependent claims 58, 68, 83, 93, 108, and 118 to conform with the amended independent claims. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the applicants' original specification.

Applicants' Reply to the Examiner's Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 51, 52, 54-56, 58, 65, 66, 68, 71-77, 79-81, 83, 90, 91, 93, 96-102, 104-106, 108, 115, 116, 118, and 121-125 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Matthews. The Examiner rejected claims 60-64, 67, 69, 70, 85-89, 92, 94, 95, 110-114, 117, 119, and 120 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Shoff. The Examiner rejected claims 53, 78, and 103 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Davis.

Applicants submit that independent claims 51, 76, and 101 are patentable over Matthews because the reference fails to show or suggest all the features of applicants' claims.

Applicants' system, method, and machine-readable media of independent claims 51, 76 and 101 are directed to an approach in which an interactive television program guide has a local memory and a remote memory. The local memory is configured to store program guide data for use by the interactive television program guide. The remote memory is configured to store supplemental data for access by the interactive television program guide. The supplemental data may include detailed descriptions, biographies, video and audio clips, trivia and so forth (see, e.g., applicants' specification at page 19, lines 17-30).

Further, the interactive television program guide monitors a user's current actions in navigating through the guide to determine a potential upcoming need for a given portion of supplemental data. And, responsive to current actions that indicate the potential upcoming need, the system automatically supplies the given portion of the supplemental data from the remote memory to the interactive television program guide in advance of the upcoming need. For example, in one illustrative embodiment of applicants' invention, the user's actions in navigating through the interactive television program guide include browsing through programs in a program listing grid. In response, the program guide supplies supplemental data for all programs currently displayed on the monitor from the remote memory to the local memory in anticipation of the user's potential wish to view the supplemental information related to the displayed programs (see applicants' specification, FIG. 4; page 21, lines 1-19).

Applicants submit that Matthews fails to show or suggest applicants' claimed approach for 1) monitoring the user's current actions in navigating through the guide to determine a potential upcoming need for a given portion of supplemental data, and 2) responding to current actions that indicate the potential upcoming need by supplying the given portion of supplemental information from the remote memory to

the interactive television program guide in advance of the upcoming need.

At most, Matthews refers to pre-caching at a local memory supplemental information about certain shows before they air based on predictive viewing tendencies (Matthews, col. 9, line 49 to col. 10, lines 13). Applicants submit, however, that Matthews pre-caching "based on predictive viewing tendencies" conveys an approach for predicting which shows the viewer will watch based on the viewer's past viewing tendencies. Therefore, Matthews fails to show or suggest applicant's claimed approach for monitoring a user's current actions in navigating through the guide to determine a potential upcoming need for a given portion of supplemental data.


Furthermore, Matthews fails to show or suggest applicants' approach for responding to current actions that indicate the potential upcoming need by automatically supplying the given portion of supplemental data from the remote memory. In particular, Matthews merely refers to pre-caching information for certain shows at some unspecified time in advance of the broadcast. Matthews, however, fails to show or suggest that the pre-caching occurs responsive to current actions by the user in navigating through the guide that indicate a potential upcoming need for a given portion of supplemental data.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, applicants submit that independent claims 51, 76, and 101 are patentable. Applicants submit claims 52-56, 58, 60-75, 77-81, 83, 85-100, 102-106, 108, and 110-125, which depend from claims 51, 76, and 101, are also patentable.

Conclusion

Applicants submit this application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. Zhang
Registration No. 52,394
Agent for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000